

amendment offered in good faith. It is not an attempt to destroy the intent of Senator Landis's amendment. My concern, as I outlined in my original statements on this amendment, was that I was concerned at the figure being a tad low. The combined advocate exemption under this amendment with a husband and wife team would be 50,000 and I think that is a substantial increase from the 20,000, but when you are looking at the figures which a farm operation may be working with, to start over with 20,000 is practically nothing and probably in most cases to start over would be almost impossible. So it's my suggestion that we raise that to a more equitable level to provide for an increase in that exemption from the creditors. As I said, this issue is such a double-edged sword it makes it very difficult. I will give it my best shot. We'll see what happens. If it fails, it fails, and then I am done attempting to do anything on the amendment. It is simply a motion offered as a policy decision for this Legislature to decide whether or not they feel that exemption is low, whether they wish to raise it. I don't wish to get into a bidding war over what the appropriate figure should be. I am simply offering one that seemed relevant when it was in a discussion I had with Senator Dierks. And that's why I have offered the amendment. I really don't...don't know what the sentiment of the body is on this particular amendment but I will offer it for your discussion and, hopefully, approval. If not, then we will go back to Senator Landis's amendment and discuss whether that is the right path to take.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Coordsen, did you wish to speak to the Rod Johnson amendment to the Landis amendment?

SENATOR COORDSEN: Yes.

PRESIDENT: All right.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body, I would like to ask Senator Landis a question...

PRESIDENT: Would you respond, please, Senator Landis?

SENATOR COORDSEN: ...with regard to this amendment. Now my original amendment to the bill increased the exemptions to \$10,000 before the floor discussion began on the rest of the problems with the bill as perceived by the body. You stated, in your opening, the reasons for returning from a two-year exemption to a \$10,000 limitation. And I think probably the